REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in the application.

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-16, and 18 are hereby amended.

1. Claim Rejection Under 35 USC 112. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for insufficient antecedent basis. Applicant has amended the claim, in the manner so rephrased by the Examiner for purposes of examination, to provide the antecedent.

2. Specification Objection and Claim Rejection Under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. The Examiner stated that the specification fails to provide an adequate written description to support the claims, particularly, as regards the "tokenization database connected to the server" of the claim. Applicant has hereby amended Claims 14-16, and 18 (including the independent claims 14 and 18) in order to more directly conform the wording of the claims to the particular words used in the specification.

Particularly, as to claims 14-16, the amendments replace the term "tokenization database" with the concept that a "tokenization server" includes access to "a dictionary" for a lookup operation to obtain a "token" indicative of certain data. This clarifies, in keeping with the terminology of the specification description, that the combination of the tokenization server, dictionary, and lookup operation to obtain the token is what was originally intended by reference to "tokenization database" terminology. Support in the specification for the terms "tokenization server", "dictionary", the lookup operation, and the "token" is found, for example, on page 9, under the heading "Tokenization of HTML", wherein the subsequent portion of the description address the tokenization server, the dictionary associated therewith, and lookup operations to

identify a token corresponding to larger data sequences of the information for communication of the token (rather than the larger data sequences of the information) in order to reduce data quantity being communicated. The description includes various reference to a "tokenized HTML file", indicating the an example embodiment is information comprising an HTML file that can be communicated through communications of tokens corresponding to larger data quantities of the entire HTML file. The tokens are converted at the recipient device, itself including a lookup dictionary or table of tokens and corresponding larger data, and reconstituted as the entirety of the information. Dependent claims 15 and 16 are amended merely to conform to the antecedents and amendments of the independent claim 14.

It appears that the other dependent claims of these rejected claims do not require amendment to so conform and have been again presented in original form.

As the Examiner did not have any substantive grounds for rejection of Claims 14-24, Applicant submits that these claims are allowable as now restated to overcome the 112 rejection.

3. Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by Hofmann. The independent claims 1, 4, 7 and 11 are hereby amended to more clearly distinguish Applicant's claimed inventions. Hofmann discloses solely a server/communication system for "streamed data" communications. Hofmann requires a Helper Server (HS) (e.g., col. 2, lines 2-24) of the network to cache streamed data (not to segregate or differentiate handling of distinct data types). The Helper Server is an intermediary of the network that receives the streamed data, caches the data, and stores it in a Playout History (PH) buffer. Because at least a significant quantity of the streamed data is retained in the PH buffer of the Helper Server, the Helper Server can then, presumably, distribute at least initial portions of the buffered streamed data more readily to a client device accessing the Helper Server and requesting the same streamed data previously

retained in the PH buffer. The arrangement can merely provide more immediate availability of streamed data content, because of the prior storage arrangement achieved by the PH buffer of the Helper Server. Hofmann does not differentiate between data types, does not tokenize to reduce quantities of data ultimately communicated to a client device, and does not include any concept of reducing quantities of the streamed data. Rather, Hofmann addresses only a particular scenario of more readily delivering streaming data to a client device upon request to the Helper Server serving as a proxy for the streaming server.

Applicant's amended claims provide limitations not shown or disclosed in the reference. In fact, Applicant's amended claims include limitations directed towards the quantity of data actually communicated (i.e., tokens are communicated as representative of larger amounts of data, but not the larger amounts of data themselves). This is an important distinction because of the differing purposes of Applicant's claimed invention and the mere ready-streaming achieved by Hofmann.

Applicant's amended claims are not anticipated by Hofmann.

Allowable Subject Matter:

The Examiner did not make any substantive rejection of claims 14-24 on art. Applicant, therefore, assumes and thanks the Examiner for the allowance of claims 14-24 based on the grounds addressed in 2, above, that the amendments here merely incorporate express language from the specification, without change of intent, subject matter, or scope, in order to more definitively describe the claimed embodiments.

Applicant further submits that the remarks and clarifying amendments in all other pending claims distinguish Applicant's claims, and Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all claims.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the undersigned attorney for Applicant respectfully requests a call to discuss any issues. The Office is authorized to charge any excess fees or to credit any overage to the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-1350.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 1, 2005

H. Dale Langley, Jr.
Reg. No. 35,927

The Law Firm of H. Dale Langley, Jr.
610 West Lynn
Austin, Texas 78703
Telephone: (512) 477-3830
Facsimile: (512) 477-4080
E-Mail: dlangley@iptechlaw.com